

REMARKS

Claims 2-6, 9-12, 15-18, 20-25 and 38-40 are currently pending in this application. Applicants thank Examiner Jacyna for participating in the interview with Applicants representatives on October 30, 2009. During the interview, Applicants proposed amending independent claims 38, 39 and 40 to include the elements of claim 2, which was objected to as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. Examiner Jacyna agreed to consider the amendment.

As such, claims 38, 39, and 40 have been amended to include the elements of cancelled claim 2. Furthermore, claims 3, 5 and 18 have been amended to maintain proper claim dependencies and avoid redundancy in view of the amendments to claims 38-40. No new matter has been added.

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable application is in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 38-40, 9-12, 15-18 and 20-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Groesbeck (U.S. 5,810,185) in view of Reifsnyder (U.S. 2,493,086). Furthermore, claims 38-40, 9-12, 15-18 and 20-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable¹ over Groesbeck in view of Pehr (U.S. 4,401,227). Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection.

¹ Applicant notes that the rejection states that the claims are rejected under "35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Groesbeck 5,810,185 in view of Pehr 4,401,227," however the rejection appears to be under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as the two reference are cited in the rejection in combination (furthermore, see page 3 of office action which is directed to obviousness).

However, in an effort to expedite prosecution, claims 38, 39 and 40 have been amended to each include the elements of dependent claim 2, which was objected to as being allowable if rewritten in independent form by the Examiner on page 4 of the Office Action mailed August 18, 2009.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 38-40 are allowable. Furthermore, claims 3-6, 9-12, 15-18 and 20-25 depend from and further define the subject matter of claim 38, 39 and 40 respectively, and therefore are also allowable.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the amendments should be entered because they place the application in condition for allowance, the application should be allowed and the case be passed to issue. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated to expedite the prosecution of the application.

Application No. 10/501,190

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Aamer S. Ahmed

Registration No. 58,958

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 ASA:MWE
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: November 2, 2009

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**